DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 125 JC 720 187

AUTHOR	Bogart, Quentin, Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings: The Junior College Conference (3rd, Arizona State University, April 15-16, 1971).
INSTITUTION	Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Bureau of Educational Research and Services.; Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Coll. of Education.
REPORT NO	ESB-41
PUB DATE	Jul 71
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Bureau of Educational Research and Services, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Effective Teaching; Inservice Teacher Education; *Junior Colleges; Preservice Education; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education; Teacher Programs; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Supply and Demand

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of this conference focus on junior college teaching and issues concerning teacher characteristics, future manpower needs, and effective teacher training. In addition to group discussion summaries, the speeches included are "Forecasts of Instructional Personnel Needs," "The Doctor of Arts Degree," "Community-Junior College Teachers," and "The Competent Community-Junior College Teacher." Also presented is a listing of characteristics of the effective teacher, a model teacher training program, qualities of good teaching, and duties and responsibilities of instructors. Some conclusions were: (1) a junior college teacher training program requires the prospective teacher to mold his educational philosophy in terms of student and community needs; (2) such a program demands a new approach to the selection of candidates and attention to the qualifications of those doing the training; (3) a short term workshop should help in meeting the needs of both current and potential junior college teachers; and (4) a graduate degree training program should provide in-depth training experience for both prospective and practicing teachers. (RN)

ED 065125

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES BULLETIN NO. 41

PROCEEDINGS
THE THIRD
JUNIOR COLLEGE CONFERENCE

APRIL 15–16,1971

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

JC 720 187

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
SEP 13 1972
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

EDITED BY QUENTIN BOGART

Published by:
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES
Dr. Merwin Deever, *Director* College of Education Arizona State University

A Publication of

Bureau of Educational Research and Services

MERWIN DEEVER, Director

College of Education

DEL WEBER, Dean

Center for the Study of Higher Education

DR. MINARD W. STOUT, Director
DR. QUENTIN J. BOGART, Conference Coordinator

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

July, 1971

Tempe, Arizona

Copies may be obtained at $1.00 per copy from

Bureau of Educational Research and Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii

"FORECASTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL NEEDS" 1
Speaker: Dr. George Hall, President
Arizona Western College

SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS 4
Dr. Don Pence, President
Central Arizona College

"THE DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE" 5
Speaker: Dr. Allan K. Ostar
Executive Director
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

"COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHERS" 13
Speaker: Dr. James W. Reynolds
Professor and Consultant of Junior College Education
The University of Texas

SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS 23
Dr. John Prince, President
Maricopa Junior College District

"THE COMPETENT COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHER" 25
Speaker: Dr. Win Kelley, Director of Forensics
Citrus College, California

THE CONFERENCE COORDINATOR SUMMARY 39
Dr. Quentin J. Bogart, Community College Specialist
Center for the Study of Higher Education, A.S.U.
Conference Coordinator

PARTICIPANTS 40

1972 CONFERENCE DATES

January 20-21, 1972

FOREWORD

Among the newest and most popular phenomena in our system of American higher education is the comprehensive community-junior college. Starting with one institution, enrolling almost 100 students in 1902, the junior college has expanded rapidly in size and scope to currently embrace a multiplicity of functions directed by nearly 100,000 faculty and affecting well over 2,000,000 students.

The Arizona system of public community-junior colleges was created by legislative act in 1960. In 1970, the system contained seven county districts operating 11 colleges, employing 1,097 full-time teaching equivalents, and enrolling 42,775 students.

The Arizona community college growth story is typical of many states. During the 1960's, states such as Illinois, Florida, North Carolina, New York, New Jersey, Minnesota, Missouri, and Colorado developed large numbers of community colleges. Accompanying this growth was an unusual demand for instructional personnel of all types. According to Dr. James W. Reynolds, one of this year's Conference participants and author of The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum, the demand was met by secondary school teachers, graduate students, college and university instructors, and men and women from business and industry. Few were trained specifically for this new teaching task (aside from those who participated in secondary school teacher preparation programs sponsored by four-year colleges and universities). Many had never taught!

Looking ahead to the "Seventies" and "Eighties", governmental units and higher educational institutions are seeking to forecast information relative to student enrollments, educational costs, curricular patterns, and specific program and course developments as well as national, state, and community needs and employment opportunities for trained personnel. In keeping with this type of research is the need to discover what types of and how many instructional personnel will be required by our community-junior colleges--nationally, regionally, state-wide, and locally--in the next ten years; and further, how can these personnel best be trained?

It is the "what types"--"how many"--and "how best to train" questions that were explored in this Third Arizona State Junior College Board of Directors-Arizona State University Conference. Dr. Win Kelley, another Conference participant, and Dr. Leslie Wilbur of the University of Southern California, point to the involvement of universities in this type of involvement in the preface of their book, Teaching in the Community-Junior College, writing "As the new institution (junior college) continues to grow and mature, new problems and needs continue to emerge. Many of these needs and problems directly involve the universities . . ." The process of exploration was scheduled into four sessions covering one and a half days.

The forecast of instructional personnel needs, types of training programs and the selection of desirable instructional competencies were areas of special interest to the Conference. Four outstanding educators, three of them junior college specialists, were selected to make presentations to the Conference on the topics presented above. Following three of the presentations, discussion groups considered each topic.

FORECASTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL NEEDS

by Dr. George Hall

I shall address myself to instructional personnel needs of our Community Junior Colleges. I see Jim Reynolds in the back of the room, and I am reminded of a few years back when Ray Shultz, Professor of Junior College Education at Florida State University, shocked a few of us who were meeting together when he announced the results of a study indicating the need for over 3,000 new community college administrators by 1980 in our nation's community junior colleges. He also said that we would need over 100,000 new community college teachers. Now Ray based his estimates on the growth of the junior colleges when we were building one new college, I think, a week throughout the United States. He looked, of course, at the population and then he discovered there was this ratio of about 20 students per junior college teacher. This ratio is valid today, nationally, as well as when one looks at the AAJC's high projections of growth for two-year colleges to 1975. Using this established ratio, we can see that these colleges, in 1975, will employ one-quarter million instructors for some five million students. Now this means an increase of 125,000 new teachers in 1975 new to the junior colleges. Another AAJC projection calls for 50,000 new junior college teachers annually from now until 1980. Obviously, all of these teachers are not full time, because we do have part time students which we equate as equivalent full time students; and we treat the faculty similarly. But the problem is still rather staggering, and I suggest this one facet deserves, I think, indeed further consideration. Now AAJC in supporting its projections, observes that the contributing factors to these projected increases are the numbers of high school graduates, the growth in percentage of college age persons seeking college attendance, the rapid expansion of curriculum and career opportunity, and the increasing popularity of adult continuing education and community service programs; plus, stepped-up recruitment of minority students. These anticipated national needs for junior college instructional personnel are impressive indeed, but I am sure that as each of you as junior college administrators receive letters of application for these teaching positions you are convinced that the junior college personnel needs can be met. It pretty well holds true throughout the nation and I notice Jim Reynolds points out in his new book that our community college teachers come from the following sources, and in this order: high school teaching backgrounds, other college university teachers, directly from our universities, from the professional schools, from business and industry, the military, and from retired ranks. These sources show evidence of ability to meet the demand of even 50,000 new junior college faculty per year. This estimate is one mentioned as being published in the AAJC booklet, Preparing Two-year College Teachers for the 70's. Now since the majority of junior college teachers have had elementary or secondary school teaching experience, it is interesting to note that job openings in public school teaching peaked in 1968-69 at about 235,000. We estimate that the number of openings in public school teaching ranks will drop to about 180,000 by 1975. And this means that many more people, teachers, with elementary and high school teaching backgrounds, are going to be seeking positions in the nation's community colleges. Also, all of us in this room, I am sure, are quite well acquainted with the possibilities that are offered when industry is disrupted and highly trained personnel are released to look for other types of employment. All of us today are receiving unsolicited letters from highly qualified people, highly qualified that is, for the vocations in which they have been working. They are people with PhD's and they are people in science and technology. I think this, too, is something that should be examined as to whether or not this

type of person is the type of person that should be selected for instructional positions in the community college.

Well, let's bring this down a little closer to home. I learned from Dr. (John) Condon that in Arizona in '69 and '70 there were employed 1,078 certificated staff members in our Arizona Community Colleges. Now assuming a 10% increase for this year, which is probably within a few percentage points of being right, we would have roughly about 1,200 teachers in our community colleges in Arizona today. Now there are several projections of full-time-student equivalents for Arizona. If we accept the figure of 40,000 FTSE for Arizona Community Colleges for the year 1975, you can see that using this established ratio, we will need about 2,000 instructors, which would be 800 new openings just in Arizona's community colleges, alone, by 1975. The thing I am trying to do through this kind of arithmetic is to reveal that there is indeed need to educate several hundred new junior college teachers to staff Arizona's two-year colleges in the 1970's and the problem becomes quite staggering when you think of it nationally. It is our hope in working with this conference that this week during these buzz sessions, we refine and better describe these needs. I am reminded as I look at the back of the room and see Stan Janeczko watching the video screen that he told me when I started that this is a one-hour tape. He said, "I'm going to give Dr. Newburn ten minutes to talk and I think I'll give Dr. Condon about eight and one-half minutes and then when you divide the time, we'll see how long are you going to talk?" I said, "I think I just changed my plans." And he replied, "No, you can talk just as long as you want. But we just won't have you recorded." I don't think there are many people who are going to agree with him that I should talk as long as I want, in fact, I see a few colleagues here from Arizona Western who, I am sure, would make it a little rough for me if I did. So I'll make this brief.

The things I do want to suggest during this conference are concerned with the kinds of people we recruit. And what honestly ought these training programs or the educational programs to be. Don't be sucked in by the advanced degrees. In one consulting position in which I participated in the Midwest, a college was opening with about 3,000 students. I talked to the president about 6 months before the opening date, and he was in the process of selecting 100 to 150 faculty members. And he said, "Gee I'm just thrilled about this, George. I could staff this college completely with men holding a PhD." I said, "I hope you have another thought, and that is that you don't do that at all, because I could not imagine anything worse." They did get quite a few of these people. The point I want to make is that this is indeed a good degree, the doctorate, but the thing I'm saying is it may not be too necessary at the community college level. At this same school I returned a couple years later as a consultant from North Central Association. I remember being in a biology lab and talking with a teacher. She was one of the more advanced people he had recruited. I asked how things were going. She said, "Well, I don't know if we are going to make it or not. I've got people here that don't even deserve to be in college." And we had a little talk about who deserves to be in college and then I carried this information on to the president.

Dr. Lee Metzger, of the University of California studied some 4,500 faculty members in 57 two-year institutions concerning attitudes. He reported that a large percentage of our present community college teachers are opposed to vocational education. He found that while 90% of the faculty endorsed transfer programs and 85% agreed that two-year technical curricula are essential, only 50% felt that occupational curricula for skills or semi-skills are essential and only 21% supported occupational education of less than two years. Actually 26%

of the faculty that Metzger surveyed felt that occupational education of less than two years was inappropriate for the junior college. Which leads me to a few of the conclusions or observations we arrived at in this work with the AAJC. The great numbers of students coming through our community college open doors possess many individual differences, yet each is entitled to learn. This poses an accountability upon the nation's junior colleges--a professional responsibility. It is reported, and I think reliably, that by specifying learning objectives in precise terms and using well-organized, self-paced instructional sequences to reach those objectives, we can guarantee learning for up to 90% of our students. We need, therefore, to establish instructional workshops such as this but on an expanded basis; workshops for orientation of instructional personnel to the community college; and we need workshops on how to develop behavioral objectives for all courses which are comprehensible to the student, and to learn to organize instruction so that achievement is the constant and time the variable. In our survey of what leaders in junior college education have to say about instructional needs today, we were admonished to identify and disseminate information regarding what has been learned about methods, materials, procedures, so that others don't plow the same ground; to increase individualization of instruction, through learning options of students, and teaching options to faculty; to revise curriculum and instruction to better serve the new students in higher education; to continue to develop modes of delivery systems for instruction, appropriate for the educationally disadvantaged; and to offer consistent and appropriate occupational education on a national level. We learned that we need a change of emphasis regarding the desirability of all to attend a four-year college; and the indoctrination of faculty to community college concepts. We need to develop new approaches, geared to individual differences and learning rates; to provide objective proof of instructional superiority, if it exists; to develop transfer integrity; and to develop and refine strategies for instruction appropriate to a wide range of abilities. We must dignify occupational education and establish the integrity of the community college.

It is our hope in bringing you together at this conference to seek a clearer understanding of these instructional tasks and goals and, in addition, that we may suggest educational changes or types of training that might appropriately help those who are teaching or who will teach in Arizona's, and in fact, the nation's community colleges to do a little better job. Thank you.

(Transcribed from audio tape.)

SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

by Dr. Don Pence

In listening to today's four discussion group reports, I heard certain recurring themes. In each of them, I noticed a recognition of the challenge that is presented if the comprehensive community college is to develop to its fullest extent and accept the challenge of training the manpower force for this nation or this state or the particular county in which our colleges are located. Because if we do, then in each of the reports certain things are recognized: If we go into the area of skills, crafts, and trades and all of the various technologies high and low, then we acknowledge that traditionally and currently, these people, the people who will teach these courses, do not come out of the university setting. These people are drawn from trades and industry and business, and have not been exposed to teaching pedagogy. And so the problem is reiterated here that where do these people, and in some cases, the professional people in our group acquire teaching skills.

Above all, it was emphasized that teachers in the comprehensive community college must have a tremendous amount of understanding and empathy to better deal with individualized instruction, because many of our students are of what we call the "developmental" type. They need individualized instruction if they are going to succeed.

The universities have a problem in teacher training. The community colleges have a problem in teacher orientation, and in selection of types of instructors who are compatible with and interested in and have empathy for vocationally oriented adults as well as with the youthful student if we are going to really do the job of training for the nation's manpower and labor pool. Our universities have been tuned up primarily for the Smith-Hughes type program, industrial arts, etc., and not for these other vocational types.

There's one new thing that was mentioned in our discussion and that is a new concept that is called "the ladder approach". This is where you get on the educational train and you get off at one station and work a while and then get back on where you left off and you come out at still a higher level. We are just beginning to initiate this in a nursing program. Another example was given in the area of stenography and secretarial-clerical sciences, where you get on and you go so far and you go out and get a job and when you come back, you have not lost that credit! That's a ladder! You're up that step and you take up the next step and go on to the higher levels.

In summation, if we're going to be truly comprehensive, then we're going to have to have teachers who are experienced, qualified, well trained and sensitive to the needs of students. This is essential if we're going to rise to the challenge of education beyond the high school for all of the people in the communities we serve.

THE DOCTOR OF ARTS VS. THE PH.D. IN EDUCATION TODAY

by Allan W. Ostar
April 15, 1971

Martin Luther in the 16th Century said that the prosperity of a country depends not on the abundance of its revenue nor on the strength of its fortifications, but in the number of its cultivated citizens, in its men of education.

In the 20th Century, many men of education have shown a disinterest in the cultivation of students and have focused on the advancement of personal expertise.

American industry has sanctified the expert.

The splintering of specialties has created the fantasy of technology, and the proliferation of services that has all but completed the decline of meaningful labor.

Scientific judgment has elevated method over content.

Methodology argues specialization, for the smallest task is level with the greatest in terms of method.

Even the study of literature is dominated today by "methods of approach" and devaluates what one feels in response to Shakespeare's orchestration of the senses, or Dryden's striving for harmony in an age when language provided a way into an orderly society, an orderly universe.

Our system of higher education affirms the necessities of method, of procedure, in its requirements leading to the research doctorate.

The modern Ph.D. program carries on the passion for limited but thorough knowledge of a piece of the whole.

Facts are pieced together by assemblages of experts who share experiences only in pools of specialties in managed scientific problem solving.

There is a failure of insight and empathy.

Students in our universities already sense a discontinuity between experiences in college and those outside.

Recent student revolts reflect the frustration of seeing little connection between what they are studying and the lives they must lead.

As the bases for common understanding shrink, says Erich Fromm, the only experience left for sharing is futility.

Since World War II, academic departments have encouraged the alienation of teacher and student.

They have done this, mainly, by pushing faculty members into publishing and away from the classroom.

Faculties have been increasingly evaluated in terms of narrow professional contributions.

The student is looked upon as a recruit to advance the special interests of a department, and the best of them are named teaching assistants and left struggling, to climb the laborious Ph.D. ladder.

Undergraduates in this system, even in universities with limited graduate programs, often do not encounter senior staff members until their junior or senior years.

We must recognize the Ph.D. for what it is, and have as an alternative the Doctor of Arts degree centered in teaching.

In the Middle Ages, the Ph.D. was a teaching degree in a university system emphasizing the colloquy of instructor and student. Students had a heavy hand in determining the direction of the university in those days, representing, as they did, the continuation of the aristocracy.

With the outcroppings of the industrial age, learning at the highest levels turned to the research objective and was separated from the requirement to teach.

Our Ph.D. developed from the German university model late in the 19th Century, after generations of Americans had gone abroad to terminate their formal education.

Research, to the action-centered American, carried a mystique, and the Ph.D. allowed them to share it.

As the importance of the doctoral program grew, a bias formed against teaching general subject matter to undergraduates.

These Ph.D.s went into American institutions and tried to transform them into replicas of the research-and award-oriented institutions from which they came--and at a time when the nation's need for teachers to handle an explosion in college undergraduate population was at hand.

I am reminded of a research fellow in chemistry who was invited to teach in an undergraduate-oriented predominantly Negro college.

He came after a short exchange of correspondence which convinced him that the college needed his doctoral expertise to help in the teaching of students derived largely from underprivileged backgrounds.

It took this well-prepared man a full year to come to terms with the frustrations of an incomplete laboratory, interrupted research, an inability to comprehend and deal with the learning difficulties of his students, and the lack of companionship among learned colleagues.

He refused a second contract to teach, after a year in which he felt cheated and misused.

He simply was not prepared to teach.

The Doctorate of Arts will shift the emphasis to teaching, not to the exclusion of research, but to put the research rationale into the perspective of actual national needs.

The Doctorate of Arts is centered in applied scholarship with the dissertation relating to curriculum and instruction at the college level.

The candidate must write a precis for development of classroom teaching materials. He will evolve these materials, devise appropriate teaching strategies, develop evaluating instruments, and test his materials in class.

The Doctorate of Arts will encourage the restructuring of present institutions into true academic communities. It will encourage the teacher-oriented degree holder to develop a bond with his students, creating an exchange of experiences where it now seldom exists.

The Doctorate of Arts, at best, will humanize higher education, bringing the student back into the center of academic life.

By becoming a "lateral process", bringing together many disciplines, the Doctorate of Arts augurs a future demand for thinkers capable of planning on the basis of whole-systems knowledge, avoiding the pitfalls of separate disciplines at cross purposes. This will be essential in correcting the abuses of urban planning.

The program can be used to improve the education of people already committed to teaching. This is a major objective.

A great many faculty members at junior colleges and undergraduate four-year colleges who have the Master's Degree, have thought only in terms of the Ph.D., as the only way they could upgrade themselves and gain recognition in academic circles.

The Doctorate of Arts represents a significant alternative for the teachers.

The Doctorate of Arts could also serve to attract graduate students in the early stages of the Ph.D. program. If the D.A. can be developed as an alternative, we may be able to reduce the number of students who would otherwise enter Ph.D. programs, thereby relieving the admissions pressure of those programs.

However, the Doctor of Arts degree must be developed slowly and cautiously.

Only a small number of institutions have been given planning grants by the Carnegie Corporation, which are designed to encourage institutions to think carefully about the D.A. instead of plunging ahead with the expansion of Ph.D. programs.

It will be important to establish the D.A. in the major, established universities.

By being a part of the graduate centers of the very prestigious universities, the Doctorate of Arts will win its place in academic tradition and propriety. It will become the model of graduate-level teaching training emphasis which the regional schools can strive for.

Let me emphasize that it will be the public four-year regional university that will ultimately bring to fruition the benefits of the Doctor of Arts program.

In developing specific goals for these institutions, it seems to me that teacher education at the doctoral level assumes major importance.

Already the Doctorate of Arts is taking root.

The concept grew out of the Carnegie Education Center established in 1966 by a $1 million grant from the Carnegie Corporation.

The first program of its kind was established in 1967 at Carnegie-Mellon University, with support from the Carnegie Corporation.

In 1969, AASCU and the Council of Graduate Schools endorsed the degree.

In October, 1970, these new programs were the subject of a national conference sponsored by the Council of Graduate Schools in cooperation with Carnegie-Mellon and attended by 80 invited participants.

Since then, 92 institutions, ranging in type from the M.I.T. to East Texas State University have already instituted, plan to institute, or are studying Doctor of Arts programs through 1972.

Fourteen institutions already offer the degree, with Carnegie-Mellon leading the way, with D.A.s terminating five areas of study. East Texas State plans to build eight programs around a terminal Doctor of Arts degree.

To date, 15 persons have received the degree from Carnegie-Mellon, and some 100 students are currently working toward it.

Idaho State University proposed the Doctorate of Arts for the areas of biology, English, government and mathematics to be implemented by fall, 1971.

According to President William Davis, Idaho State is already a teacher-oriented school and looks at the D.A. as a means to strengthen existing purposes.

Idaho's Graduate Council received D.A. proposals from the major departments and also expressed interest in the interdisciplinary areas of the physical sciences, environmental sciences, business-economics, and comparative social systems.

To build the D.A. program, Idaho is increasing its library holdings five times. Its program in the biological sciences will be housed in a new $3.7 million life science facility.

Following AASCU criteria for the establishment of the Doctor of Arts degree, Idaho will emphasize two semesters of work in history, philosophy, sociology and economics of American higher education.

It will establish an internship program in the third year. Idaho hopes to enter into agreement with a number of junior colleges, community colleges and other institutions without a graduate program.

An intern at one of these institutions would teach a regular faculty load and would be assigned as an observer on at least one standing faculty committee.

The intern would be under the immediate supervision of a senior faculty member chosen by the cooperating institution for his skill in teaching.

This supervisor would receive a $500 stipend for his services.

The intern would be visited at least once during his internship by his graduate advisor who would confer with the cooperating institution.

Idaho Doctor of Arts Fellows, based on a three-year cycle, will receive $2,600 the first year, $2,800 the second, and $3,000 the third and final year of the program.

Idaho's budget for the first year, 1971-72, calls for $113,000; $225,000 during 1972-73; and $371,000 for 1973-74. These amounts would cover the primary costs of maintaining the fellowships, travel to cooperating institutions and stipends to supervising teachers.

At Ohio State University last September, the Board of Trustees approved and submitted to the Ohio Board of Regents a proposal that would make Ohio State the first institution in Ohio to offer the Doctorate of Arts.

At Ohio State, a Doctor of Arts student must complete a minimum of 135 quarter hours of graduate work beyond the baccalaureate degree with at least 10 credit hours per quarter.

He must serve a teaching internship of at least three credit hours per quarter and complete a professional project of research relating his field of study to higher education.

In addition, the Ohio State program will require a written and an oral general examination and an oral final examination.

These programs are typical of initial Doctor of Arts programs across the country that are already under attack for undermining the value of the Ph.D.

Strong opposition comes from younger faculty members in state colleges who were indoctrinated in graduate school that research is far more important than teaching.

Because of the possible opposition by faculty majorities, most community and state colleges are reluctant to accept the program.

If too many colleges offer it, critics say, the Doctorate of Arts will be considered second rate.

One critic brands efforts to push what he calls the old idea of the Doctor of Arts as bordering on the criminal.

He noted the vast surplus of science Ph.D.s emerging from our universities and added that there will be a useless welter of competition for the few positions open to them.

Other critics say it's insane to begin a new degree program at a time when graduate students face rising unemployment in many professions.

Is keeping our graduate schools full, worth creating additional suffering and loss? they ask.

National production of doctorates almost tripled from 1958 to 1969. According to the U.S. Office of Education, 38,700 will be produced per year--about 13,000 more than in 1969.

Allan Cartter, Chancellor of New York University, estimates that the annual doctoral capacity of institutions now offering the degree will be between 40,000 and 50,000 by 1976.

More recently, Lewis Mayhew predicted a figure of 70,000.

Cartter and a colleague, Robert Farrell, estimate that in 1980 there will be 24,550 new doctorates available for teaching, but only 11,600 vacancies, even if the student-faculty ratio were improved by one per cent per year.

Cartter a so estimates that the proportion of doctorates who go into teaching will drop roughly from 50 per cent to 20 or 30 per cent by 1980.

For a decade, colleges and universities have employed 50 per cent or more of the new Ph.D.s.

In the seventies, Cartter doubts the figure will even reach 40 per cent.

The last ten years have witnessed a euphoric growth--in enrollments, in federal and state support for research, in facilities, and in rising faculty salaries.

American higher education, Cartter says, like any other business that has lived for years with a 10 per cent growth rate, will have to adjust to a more normal two or three per cent rate.

Cartter additionally notes that our graduate schools may be entering a long period of overproduction and excess capacity.

Would indeed the Doctorate of Arts add to the glut of doctoral graduates? Where will the glut go?

I contend that they will have to go to places held by many holders of the doctorate to be academic Siberia.

We are witnessing a tremendous boom in four-year public and junior college enrollments, and I think you would agree that anything that can be done to upgrade the quality of instruction would be desirable.

The community two-year and public four-year regional universities already account for over 50 per cent of all students enrolled in higher education.

By 1980, junior colleges will enroll four million students and become the largest major segment of higher education--yet few Ph.D.s look for jobs in those institutions.

According to a study by Hans Rosenhaupt of Princeton University, 15 per cent of all U.S. students were enrolled in the two-year colleges in 1965, yet only 2.1 per cent of the Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows surveyed that year were teaching in two-year colleges.

Private institutions, then enrolling only 24 per cent of the students, employed 50 per cent of all Woodrow Wilson Teaching Fellows.

In fiscal 1970, 29,360 doctorates were produced, 14.1 per cent more than the year before. The largest increase in Ph.D.s went into education, only to find themselves virtually stalemated. About 15,000 will be absorbed this year.

Ph.D. holders in English jammed recent regional meetings of the Modern Language Society, to find few available jobs and marginal recruiting.

The Committee on Human Resources and Advanced Education, in its 1970 Staff Report, estimated that new faculty appointments for replacement and growth will number about 20,000 a year during the next five years--hardly an encouraging rate. Many will have to turn to teaching in the community colleges--the only expanding sector in higher education.

The disillusionment experienced by many doctoral candidates looking for teaching jobs in the larger state universities can be summarized by the reaction of a student who had just heard about the Doctor of Arts program. "What I've just learned makes me sick," he said. "I'm just winding up a Ph.D., and the D.A. is what I really need."

The Doctor of Arts is coming at a time when the concepts of the community college and open admissions policies are unfolding. Minorities, who, in the past, were shut out of our higher education, are now being admitted with the deficiencies that go with decades of denial. They will need dedicated teachers.

Mary Wortham, a member of the Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges, recently told me there is no doubt that the need for a new type of graduate education for two-year college teaching is very much in demand in California and that the representatives for those colleges have officially asked for the Doctor of Arts program.

California is an indication of where state spending for higher education is likely to go.

Over the past five years, state spending for all higher education has increased by 167 per cent, and for the junior-community colleges by 393 per cent.

The Doctor of Arts program must not be allowed to merely justify the existence and growth of graduate faculties. If the program can be used to improve the education of people already teaching, then everyone will applaud it.

If the Doctorate of Arts serves to attract graduate students who have been successful in the early stages of the Ph.D. program but who are doomed to "unemployment by overqualification" out of the conventional Ph.D. programs, then the Doctorate of Arts performs a valuable service.

But if the Doctorate of Arts attracts students who would not otherwise be entering the teaching profession, hoping for an easy way to gain academic

status, it would be a disservice to all.

The president of one of America's most prestigious universities once said that it takes 300 years to develop a major research institution.

Where does that leave the rest of us? we could well ask.

It leaves us at the threshhold of a new era.

Robert Nisbet of the University of California says the time has come when the dogma of scholarship and teaching as ends in themselves may have to be set aside.

Students may no longer find it rewarding to scurry into the narrow, deep channels of specialist learning.

The typical doctoral program may ironically be the victim of what has so long maintained it--technology and the release from labor.

The 21st Century may witness the first perpetual students bringing the profession of teaching to the level of the most valued scientific research.

If an old attitude was to build one's identity on a defined and little changing labor role, the new attitude must center on the person capable of dealing with renewing roles--he must continually learn.

Man, the student, has always worked against time and has viewed learning as a series of terminal experiences. Education affirmed what was expected of him. The student, in time, would learn what was formulated as necessary. He would move from pre-school to graduate school with an objective in society already shaped for him.

But the modern graduate faces at least seven different careers with seven concomitant training periods.

The current elementary-secondary-college process geared to the preparation of a single occupation does not meet today's changing employment demands.

There will be no room for elitism in a society needing all its members to achieve a survival balance.

I see the Doctor of Arts degree as a first step in a new order of relationship of teacher to student, institution to society.

It will help bring back the humanist spirit and the wisdom necessary to shape an agreeable society out of the complexity and tragedy of modern progress in a world grown too old for aliens.

PROGRAMS FOR THE PREPARATION OF COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHERS:
LIBERAL ARTS AND OCCUPATIONAL

by James W. Reynolds

When I agreed to prepare a presentation on programs for the preparation of J.C. teachers, my first concern was that of holding the many implications in sufficient control to enable their coverage within a reasonable time limit. Obviously, if they were developed fully, the description would easily fill a book. In establishing control, however, I ran the risk of understressing some implications that would hold a high priority for some of the listeners. This risk I have accepted. For those who may feel my judgment was faulty in including or omitting what I did, I can only say that I regret sincerely their reaction. The time came when I had to make a decision. The decision once made has to be lived with. Thus, for the duration of this paper I shall do such living.

One factor influencing my decision is the other presentation which will be made this afternoon. It will deal with a more detailed examination of the professional competencies needed by junior college teachers. Since it is manifestly impossible to divorce means from ends completely, it is subsequently impossible for me to avoid overlap entirely. I have done my best to keep such overlap from assuming a substantial proportion of my paper.

A second limitation imposed arbitrarily is that of making only a minimum of distinction between liberal arts and occupational teachers. It is acknowledged readily that the differences between these two categories of teachers are great. Academic aptitude, amount of previous education, even the attitudes of each type are among the differences. The decision, however, grew out of assigning a lower priority of importance to these differences as compared with the factors which will receive major consideration.

Evidence utilized in the descriptive account was derived from four sources: (1) replies to letters sent to 15 universities extending from Washington State to Florida; (2) replies to letters sent to 30 junior colleges from coast to coast; (3) materials supplied from ERIC at U.C.L.A.; and (4) a chapter in manuscript form generously supplied by Dr. Arthur M. Cohen from a book co-authored by Cohen and Florence Brawer, Toward Identity: The Community College Instructor as a Professional Person. This book will be published later this year by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

The remainder of the paper will be devoted to a descriptive and critical account of the topic: "Programs for the Preparation of Community-Junior College Teachers". The traditional categories, pre-service and in-service, are used for the sake of greater clarity.

Not only are the traditional categories used, but the traditional functions assigned to each category have been observed. Pre-service preparation, for example, provides the prospective teacher a grounding in the several aspects of professional competence needed for the initiation of a professional career. In-service preparation, on the other hand, enables the professional practitioner the opportunity to keep his competence apace with the many new developments that are constantly occurring. Without the in-service preparation, professional obsolescence is inevitable.

Brawer and Cohen point out in their chapter to which reference was made that pre-service programs are growing in number. In 1954, they assert, there were only 54 colleges and universities which offered so much as one course on the junior college. By 1968, there were 75 institutions that offered not only one course but whole sequences for junior college staff preparation. They state that by 1970, under the impetus provided by the Education Professions Development Act, more than 200 colleges and universities indicated interest in establishing programs to prepare junior college instructors.

In-service programs are also growing rapidly. Among the influencing factors in this growth are the efforts of the American Association of Junior Colleges and several of the subsidy programs of the Federal Government. Of the replies I received from my letters to junior colleges, only one spoke of doing very little, and then proceeded to describe his program, which was as comprehensive as some of the others.

The large number of programs in each major category makes it impossible to describe each in detail. Because of this, an attempt has been made to select for description those aspects which are common to many. It must be kept in mind, though, that the use of this procedure does not imply that a complete generalization is possible. It is not. Moreover, the description of the programs is confined insofar as possible to their general nature. Little attempt has been made, for the reason previously listed, to go into any consideration of the attributes of successful junior college teachers.

Pre-service programs, for a clearer analysis, may be divided into two major types: (1) the formally organized, and (2) the unorganized. The latter, although obviously lacking any but the most rudimentary formal structure, is included because a significant number of junior college teachers are recruited from this source.

The formally organized programs usually include three parts: (1) that part concerned with professional or pedagogical preparation; (2) that part concerned with the academic or technical content of the teaching field or fields; and (3) that part consisting of the interne activities. While variations will be found in the several programs in each of the parts, in the main, the three-part program is common to all.

The area of professional or pedagogical preparation usually includes courses dealing with the philosophy of the junior college and those concerned with curriculum and instruction in the junior college. Most frequently, these are taught in courses separated from the content areas. Some integration of the professional and content areas usually occurs in the interneship, where the student makes practical application of the theories and the principles that he has learned.

Courses in the philosophy of the junior college vary widely in their comprehensiveness. Some are limited to the historical and philosophical concepts associated with the development, growth, and present status of the junior college movement while others attempt to present to the student an overview of the operational aspects of these institutions. In the latter approach, course content includes consideration of support and control, administration, the curriculum, the instructional staff, students, student personnel services, community services, relations with four-year colleges, the physical plants, and many others.

Courses on curriculum and instruction in the junior colleges usually are organized to give the student a basic groundwork for his professional activities as a teacher. In these courses he obtains some understanding of the comprehensiveness of the curriculum structure within which he will be working. He should, and often does, obtain a grasp of the heterogeneous nature of the students with whom he will be working. He learns, too, of the variety of instructional methodologies available for his use, and hopefully, some basis for determining appropriate situations in which each will operate more effectively, as well as how to develop innovative methodologies to substitute in those situations in which the more traditional methodologies do not seem to be satisfactory.

In the area of evaluation, in general, the assistance provided to the junior college teacher is minimal. This may be due to a mistaken notion existing in some college or university programs that instruction in this important area is not essential.

The second area of preparation in academic or technical content usually occupies a substantially larger part of the program quantitatively than does that in professional preparation. The ratio of content to professional preparation may run as high as three or four to one.

The obvious function of this part of the program is to provide the answer to the question of what to teach. Over-specialization may enter into this part of the program in two dimensions: (1) the content courses may be restricted to one subject matter field in contrast to an interdisciplinary approach, and (2) the advanced level at which these courses are located in the college or university programs may result in the narrowness in focus characteristic of many such advanced level courses. Whether such degrees of specialization are desirable or not is a controversial question. Regardless of the point of view taken, though, the aspect of specialization is more likely to occur in a liberal arts field than in an occupational program.

The reverse of over-specialization sometimes occurs in the professional fields. Since prospective teachers in all fields take the courses in methodologies, it may appear expedient to the instructor to over-generalize. Thus, the presentation of principles of methods in this generalized manner occasionally creates problems when the prospective teacher undertakes to apply them to teaching a single discipline.

Some of the junior college personnel who replied to my letter expressed a preference for content preparation to be interdisciplinary. Their reason for such a preference was the fact that in many junior colleges teaching assignments cover more than one discipline. Another reason for preferring an interdisciplinary type of content preparation is to facilitate subject matter integration in general education programs in junior colleges.

The third part of the program, the interneship, finds its greatest variability in the length of the interneship period and the responsibilities to be assumed by the interne. These vary all the way from instances in which the interne serves as little more than a teacher's aid for a relatively short period of time to those in which the interne assumes full responsibility for teaching for a full quarter, a semester, or an academic year. Supervision is usually provided by the staff of the college or university in which the program is based, and by the staff of the junior college in which the interneship is served. For the most part, interneships are served in junior colleges.

Unorganized programs usually consist of content courses entirely. The student takes a master's degree in his teaching field and occasionally a course in the pedagogical field, and secures a job on this basis. A new variant of this procedure may develop as a result of the shortage in the demand for persons with earned doctorates. Among those who presumably have prepared themselves for teaching positions in four-year colleges, the sharply decreased opportunities in this area may turn many to looking for jobs in junior colleges.

Pre-service programs differ among colleges and universities on the basis of the length of their duration and the awards obtained for completing them. Generally, their duration runs from one to two years. The awards for completion include such titles as masters, master of arts in teaching, and educational specialist.

A recent development in the matter of awards is the emergence of the doctorate of arts. Devised to focus study on developing teaching proficiency as contrasted to the more heavily research orientation of the doctorate of philosophy, it is being urged by some as an appropriate degree for junior college teachers as well as for teachers in lower divisions of four-year colleges. Its comparative recency, however, has prevented its attaining the respectability attached to the Ph.D. Whether or not this disadvantage can ever be overcome remains to be seen.

The previously defined function of the pre-service preparation programs assigned to them the responsibility of providing the prospective teacher a grounding in the several aspects of professional competence needed for the initiation of a professional career. In this definition, the implication is clear for a broadly based program. Greater specialization should be left to the in-service program, as needs are recognized in the instructional activity of the junior college teacher. One criticism which may be levied against some pre-service programs is that breadth is abandoned for premature specialization. This specialization may be noted in three areas: (1) philosophies of junior college education, (2) the course work in the content areas (already considered), and (3) courses in instructional media.

The apparent desire on the part of some instructors to make of the junior college a completely unique educational institution frequently obscures its inherent relationship to the preceding and, sometimes, to the succeeding parts of the educational hierarchy. Moreover, the continued insistence that the junior college must always be regarded as a part of higher education obscures the evolutionary process which will inevitably assign to the junior college years the top two years of an educational process started in the first grade rather than the bottom two years of an educational process ending with the upmost years of the graduate school. Prospective junior college teachers are done a disservice when they are not helped to understand this most significant trend.

Another instance of the exercise of over-specialization exists in instruction in non-print media in some of the programs. Basic to the effective use of such media in instruction is the intrinsic motivation of the faculty member to use such aids in instructional situations. This, in turn, depends on the teacher's developing an understanding of the strengths and limitations of each instructional medium. In some instances, these two important steps in learning are overlooked completely. The net results of this can be a reduced efficiency in their use, or a completely extrinsic motivation for using the media, in other words, an excursion into gadgetry.

Personal work with junior college teachers who are products of pre-service programs leads one to the suspicion that there are some neglected areas in the professional part of the program. Difficulties in developing behavioral objectives represents one such area. The concept involved in such objectives, though comparatively recent in its origin, is not so recent that some of the younger teachers should have been left unfamiliar with it.

For teachers in the liberal arts areas, there is still much evidence of too rigid adherence to the traditional approaches. The concepts involved in basic or guided studies developments are completely unacceptable to many of these who have not been emancipated from the traditions of the liberal arts.

At this point in my paper, I deliberately inject as a neglected area, one which is based solely on personal prejudice. I have observed educational procedures over a sufficiently long span to recognize that at regular intervals, new fetishes are raised for the unrestricted adoration of the rank and file. While each of these contain a modicum of desirability, the exaggerated claims made for them at the outset can be said to be nothing but ridiculous. Such a fetish currently is accountability. The neglected area, in this instance, is intelligent sales resistance--the power to avoid being swept off one's feet with the cascading stream of rhetoric, and the equally important power of perception enabling the person possessing these perceptive powers to see through the facade of flaming rhetoric into the minute but important residue of desirable elements.

The point has been made earlier that one of the neglected areas in the pre-service education of prospective junior college teachers is that of evaluation. Observation of junior college faculty groups leads to the suspicion that many are deficient in at least three areas of this field: an acceptance of the fact that evaluation has an indispensable place in judging every professional activity and not just judgments of students' progress; an understanding of the integral relationship of measurement and evaluation; and a sophisticated understanding of what measurement devices are most appropriate in certain situations. (Can be expanded.)

A final neglected area in the pre-service program is that of orienting teachers to the importance of constant in-service education. Probably this area is more neglected in the unorganized programs than in the organized ones, mainly because the unorganized programs are less likely to include components in the area of professional education. Junior college administrators of instruction have a right to expect that the faculty members, in turn, will expect to participate annually in in-service programs.

Pre-service preparation programs have been examined as a basis for criticisms, and an observation of certain neglected areas. Another category for examination of these programs pertains to the problems normally encountered in administering such programs.

The first perplexity identified for examination is that encountered in those states which require certification for teaching in public junior colleges. For those who desire to experiment, the certification requirements may provide an inhibiting force. For those who prefer the security in program development of following a fixed pattern, these requirements would constitute a blessing, not a problem. Further consideration of this problem, however, is largely academic, since only 10 of the fifty states require certification--a ratio of one in five.

A second problem facing those who offer pre-service preparation programs for prospective junior college teachers is the fact that prospective employers of the products of such programs are currently in a buyer's market. One question asked junior college presidents, in my letter to them, was: "Do you customarily rely on certain universities and colleges for a substantial proportion of the new teachers you employ?" Invariably, in the 30 replies I received, the answer was, "No". Accompanying this response in a large number of cases was the comment, "For every potential vacancy I have, I have anywhere from 100 to 300 applicants. All I have to do is to go through my files and pick out the applications that appear best. Then I follow up on these."

One respondent expressed a different comment. He said that in no case did he employ anyone just out of graduate school. When queried further, he acknowledged that if the person had had previous junior college teaching experience, he would consider him.

Still another junior college president asked why he should employ prospects from organized pre-service programs when he could now get Ph.D.s for the same price. One might question his judgment, but could not question the fact that, to say the least, Ph.D.s are available for junior college jobs in increasing numbers.

A third respondent who provided the information by telephone indicated that his university was getting out of the pre-service business this coming fall. In his case, however, his program was an experimental type, depending on the cooperation of junior colleges for its existence. The real cause for his abandoning the program was that economic conditions made it next to impossible for them to continue their cooperation.

The same factors which are making the employment of the instructional staff in the junior college more and more a buyer's market, are making it more difficult for additional universities and four-year colleges to initiate the offering of pre-service programs. Tight money is causing many universities and four-year colleges difficulty in holding the line with their current offerings. The possibility of launching new programs is becoming increasingly more difficult. Moreover, in those institutions having offered such programs for several years, the chances for expanding the programs, or improving them if the improvements require additional funds, are decreasing rapidly.

From the preceding instances of problems--the buyer's market, and the tight money--the implication is strong in the direction that survival of programs of pre-service preparation depends on the production of excellent teachers. In this context, still another problem may be observed. As the offering of pre-service programs became steadily more popular, the staffing of these programs with personnel qualified by experience and collegiate training became more difficult. This has resulted in some staffing with personnel whose expertise is limited to the textbooks they read. It is acknowledged that one doesn't necessarily have to have been a horse in order to be a veterinarian, yet, at the same time, actual junior college professional experience often does enhance the affectiveness of a person teaching other people to be junior college teachers.

While it was pointed out earlier that little consideration would be given to the difference between preparation programs for liberal arts or for occupational teachers, this difference does constitute one of the problems confronting those who provide comprehensive programs including both types. The area in

which the problematical aspects of such an endeavor will obviously be most noticeable is in the area of content mastery. Universities and four-year colleges usually have resources for preparing teachers for the liberal arts category. Preparing teachers for the occupational education category, however, requires resources found in a much smaller number of institutions.

Finally, any comparison of the several pre-service programs currently offered, reveals that the control of these programs varies from institution to institution. The commonest pattern is for the control to be exercised by the college or department of education. Frequently, when this is done, control over the content area is lodged with the areas involved. In the unorganized programs, control to all intent and purpose rests exclusively with the departments in which the master's degree is being offered. Occasionally, when this type of control exists, the heavier emphasis on doctora' programs reduces master's programs almost to consolation prizes for those unable to qualify for the doctorate.

A third variant of control is one exercised under the euphamistic title of "all-university". Your speaker confesses to a bit of skepticism about this type. Centering control in a widely representative committee often fails to get the job done.

One might conclude that after listing and discussing this array of criticisms, neglected areas, and problems attendant on pre-service programs your speaker takes a distinctly dim view of their feasibility--feasibility for new programs; feasibility for existing programs--feasibility of these programs. Nothing could be more in error than such a conclusion. That criticisms are justified is true of any operation. That these are neglected areas--in reality, another form of criticism--is equally true. That operations are confronted with problems is a normal way of life. To go blandly along without observing these criticisms and problems is to court trouble in a big way. A realistic attitude is essential for success and this has been an effort in the direction of realism.

In-Service Education

At the risk of being repetitive, the point should again be made that in-service education exists to sharpen up the generalized competencies acquired in pre-service programs and to keep up to date with the newer developments in the field. As has also been pointed out before, the incidence of junior colleges with organized in-service programs is very high. As a matter of fact, it is almost inconceivable to think of a junior college without such programs.

In the letter prepared to elicit information from junior colleges about their in-service programs, they were asked to list types of programs. Since the selection was made on the basis of writing to personal friends, I was extremely apprehensive about asking for a list of the problems they were working on. I knew that they knew that there is no end to the phases of the program being studied, and that if I asked about the problems under study, they would know that senility had taken over all the way and that in my weakened mentality, there was no reason to honor my request for information.

The types of in-service programs also run into large numbers. When I listed all of those types supplied to me by the junior college respondents, and augmented the list by types not mentioned, I came out with 16 different items. The reason the number was so small was that I devised generic titles to combine several types under one heading.

A further synthesis in which the number of faculty members involved was used as the organizing rationale made possible reducing the number to three. There were those types involving only one faculty member, such as participation in Academic Year Institutes or advanced level study facilitated by a year's leave of absence from the college and payment of a part of the salary. The second category referred to types in which only a group of faculty members were included, but not the faculty as a whole. Types assigned to this category were workshops, on or off campus, departmental meetings, and attendance at professional conferences. The third category comprised the faculty as a whole and included such types as institutional self studies required by regional accrediting associations, and pre or post session planning conferences.

In order to illustrate these types, type titles will be used and illustrated by actual examples. It was thought that this would provide the best expository treatment of in-service education.

Workshops on campus - A group of faculty members met together for 6 weeks or more during the summer, with full pay, to overhaul the courses in a department or plan new ones.

Workshops off campus - Arizona State University conducts a workshop on its campus during the summer for teachers of English. If funded, the participants receive stipends and expenses.

Extension classes - Taught on an individual problem approach with the teacher from a nearby university spending all day on the campus working with the faculty individually or in groups as they devise means for solving their problems. Perhaps a one-hour lecture-discussion session on pertinent problems of junior colleges.

Consultants - This may be a variant of the preceding, or may be a case of the consultant providing suggested solutions to instructional problems. Beware the consultant who has all the answers--or the one who has none.

Professional Conferences - Either by subject matter fields or by whole bodies of junior college teachers. Part or all of expenses paid and in some instances, the junior college is closed for the day--TJCTA.

Departmental Meetings - Because of over-concern for housekeeping chores, often is not in-service education. When the meeting is devoted to working on the professional problems in the department, can be excellent in-service education.

Learning Resources Center - Assumes the LRC is staffed to advise with teachers about various types of instructional media --print and non-print--and to provide technical advice on the preparation of non-print media such as transparencies.

Institutional Self Studies - Too well known to require description. Have wondered, though, why it is necessary to wait 10 years between such studies. Why not divide departments into 3 or 4 groups and have one group do a self study every 3 or 4 years. Not nearly so much work nor the chance for nearly so much obsolescence.

College-wide Studies of a Specific Problem - Student personnel program at Lawton meet for a week or two before the academic year starts, with pay, to plan points of emphasis for the year. Meet a week or two at the end of the year, with pay, to evaluate progress. All faculty included.
Pre and Post Session Planning

Advanced Study in College - One private junior college reported a modified sabbatical arrangement. Staff members after 3 years had leave of absence to go back to college with part of salary paid. Took junior college approved program of work. Risk that they wouldn't return but usually did.

Intervisitation - Expenses paid to visit junior college classes in other cities which were reputed to be excellent. Pre-planned with conferences available.

Interinstitutional Consortia - Federally funded through AAJC. Dual with a variety of problems.

Orientation - Usually conducted by department chairmen and dean of instruction.

Supervision - Again department chairmen.

You have listened to a procession of types of in-service activities. I hope it has not been wearisome. It may occur to some of you, however, to protest that these are with few exceptions, in reality, nothing but problem-solving devices. My response to such a protest is that no better educational experience can occur than that involved in solving problems.

In my letter to the junior college presidents, I raised the question of what procedures were used in evaluating the effectiveness of the in-service program. For most responses, it was a variant of informed evaluation. I have a strong feeling that more could be done. Behavioral objectives could be written in many instances to sharpen the thrust of the in-service programs. Objective evidence could be gathered, frequently, to measure progress toward the objectives. I am convinced the net result would be an increased base for confidence in the effectiveness of in-service education.

There is no doubt that successful in-service programs depend for their initiation, operation, and conclusion on top flight leadership. Within the junior college itself, there are two positions of strategic importance: the dean of instruction and the departmental chairmen.

The policy followed by some junior colleges in awarding these positions only to extroverted and popular individuals who do not possess the expertise needed is nothing short of criminal. These positions require personnel who

are outstanding experts in curriculum and instruction principles, communication skills, and personnel supervision.

If such a person is selected as a dean of instruction, another practice must be eliminated altogether: loading him down with so many non-related responsibilities that he doesn't have time to do his job. His job is a full-time one, and he must be accorded full time to do it.

Inept professional performance is all too often the professional characteristic of departmental chairmen. In many instances, the cause for the ineptness is the fault of the college, not the incumbent. There is probably no position in the administrative hierarchy whose responsibilities are so poorly defined as that of the department chairman. It's high time we take it out of the no man's land it has occupied for so long, and to give it detailed definition.

In this area of professional leadership for junior college in-service programs, personnel from four-year colleges and universities can provide most satisfactory back-up work for the on-campus leaders. When such back-up work is done, however, care must always be exercised to avoid undercutting the confidence of the junior college faculty members in their own leaders.

As I said at the outset, the implications of the topic assigned to me could fill a book. For fear that some of you suspect I am going to do just that, let's quit.

SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

by Dr. John Prince

To summarize the session's discussions very quickly, starting with Dr. Berry's remarks I would point out that Northern Arizona University, as he indicated, has a training program for preparing teachers of junior college English. This program is being evaluated at this time, and we're very hopeful something good will come out of this. The University of Arizona also, as I understand, has started a program training English teachers for junior college. It is to be evaluated this month (April, 1971) and I happen to have the privilege of being one of those on the evaluation team. Dr. Berry further indicated that teachers on staff, as well as students in the graduate program, certainly need special university courses to get these prospective teachers and already-on-staff teachers better oriented to what is needed in the classroom of the junior college. Those were the two major points in that particular group.

The next group, reported by Don Johnson, said that what we really need in the junior colleges is a very sensitive kind of teacher. One that is not necessarily subject-matter oriented but is student-centered and has an unusual empathy with the young people. Anybody who has worked for five years or so and has put up with the vicissitudes of capitalism, laissez-faire capitalism, perhaps, may have the ability to relate better because we notice success and failure in that world, like most worlds, depends upon sensitivity to people and the ability to get along.

It's usual for teachers to instruct on several levels in the junior college and the subject matter may not be, as we've indicated, the most important thing. The training programs we're talking about do need some kind of attractiveness; there needs to be a kind of reward for the staff members to go into these, I suspect. Incremental recognition on a district salary schedule or college salary schedule, would be one way to achieve this. Graduate credit carefully conceived by the universities in the right kind of courses could be given for those who pursue these. Graduate teachers involved in such training must know the junior college; in fact, the graduate teachers might serve their internships in junior colleges. Dr. Bogart, who has not had junior college teaching, could well have been sent by the university over to a junior college for six months to get him ready for this kind of job and I think we would all buy this approach.

Again, Wayne McGrath mentioned the need for student centered teachers. We seem to get pretty good agreement on this. It is not just the subject matter.

In-service training very definitely is needed; however, it's got to be handled with real managerial skill. You're simply not going to line up programs and force staff members into them and expect to get very good results. There should be options open to faculty--different ways for them to achieve this kind of attitudinal change; whether they do it in-service, or whether they do it in some university. It was indicated that there should be in-service training developed at the department level so it becomes truly an intimate situation because you are working with all of those instructors who are bound together by their departmental as well as their subject matter relationship. This really accomplishes what's needed on a very proper and sound basis. I like that idea very much.

And Bill Berg made a very excellent point and he stated it most eloquently when he said that all had been said. Bill, I want to congratulate you on that. I thought you handled that point very well. That's the tragic situation of any last speaker.

The universities need to work closely with those of us in the junior colleges in the teacher training program. I think the community colleges having gone out into the communities and set up advisory committees, working closely with men in business and industry and the professions, could teach the universities something. I know that the universities in Arizona have done this on occasion, set up advisory committees, and this is to be commended and certainly should be expanded. We would be glad to make an evaluation of the course work related to preparing junior college teachers by the universities which would be certainly to our benefit.

The question of internship needs emphasis. This seems to have in one particular discussion group a great value. The staff members in many areas actually should go into job experience outside the college. This has been done by some of us, I know, and we attempt to get our staff members working in Motorola or hospitals; nurses going on to the floors on particular assignment. This type of thing of going from the classroom back into the work experience situation certainly is, in the vocational training areas, a very important thing.

And finally, much of what is coming out of this conference as I see it, is that we need the right kind of doctorate. The Ph.D. may not be the right kind of doctorate for the community college teacher. My personal opinion is that in some areas it probably is satisfactory; but in many areas a greater breadth, less study in depth with no particular emphasis upon the question of research and publication is more appropriate.

THE COMPETENT COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHER

by Win Kelley

I. The Nature of the Task

The topic of competencies, skills, and attitudes for effective CJC teaching is as old as the junior college itself, dating back to the 19th century when private high school academies expanded their offerings to include the first two years of college study. After the birth of the first public two-year colleges during the first decade of this century, the problem of effective teaching grew more complicated and the solutions more sophisticated. Over the decades the two-year colleges tried to train and improve their instructors, particularly the new ones, by the use of in-service training programs. Truthfully, they had no choice. Their new instructors came from the high school level or from industry and business. Some others came fresh from their universities. Not one of these teachers had been trained for teaching at the CJC level. Their expertise came from on-the-job training.

Administrators were patient with their recruits. They needed teachers, and they gave their staffs time to improve on the job. They didn't have the problem of teacher anxiety as in the case of an anxious paratrooper being readied to make his first jump from an airplane. Faced with the first test, the paratrooper broke down and requested a transfer. When asked why he wanted the transfer, he said, "Well, I guess I don't like to practice anything where I have to be perfect the first time."

Today's CJC recruits are acting more and more like that paratrooper. Competition for CJC teaching is keen, and the teachers realize that they need to be effective, not only to secure a job but also to hold it. (500 applicants for 13 jobs at Citrus College in the last two years.) We now have over 1,000 community-junior colleges with over 100,000 teachers and over two million students. Historically, the universities have been slow in developing special training programs for teachers at this level. In fact, most existing programs were started within the last decade. The pace is picking up. We are now dramatically on the threshhold of the time when almost all new CJC teachers will be graduates of these programs. In the very near future, very few will be hired directly from high school or university teaching. The trend has begun. The question today is "how can these new programs screen the candidates and provide the experiences that will foster in them effectiveness as CJC teachers?"

The nature of the task is clear enough. Standard are at least four areas of the task facing the university: First, competencies (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) must be identified. Secondly, these needs must be clearly translated into behavioral objectives. Thirdly, the means must be developed to help the candidates reach these objectives. Finally, through testing and evaluation, a fairly accurate prediction must be made in regards to the possible success of the program graduate as a full-time CJC teacher.

My own role in this conference is to speak to the point of the needed competencies. In discussing this point, I have to take issue with some rather distinguished educators. Jacques Barzun, for instance, in his book Teacher in America, looks with disdain upon any standard listing of qualities of effective teaching. His argument is this: since students display a variety of human traits, teachers also can have varied traits, including weak traits, and still

be effective. The fallacy of the argument, in my estimation, is that Barzun's mitigation of weak traits (the teacher's deficiencies of knowledge, for instance) can only result in partial effectiveness, at the most. In the CJC the aim should be total teacher effectiveness, even though this ideal is difficult to reach. In another case, Carl Rogers, speaking to a group of teachers at Harvard University, indicated that one cannot teach another person how to teach, that the only significant learning is self-discovered, self-appropriated. This argument overlooks the fact that we in the CJC are constantly teaching by personal example (whether we know it or not), that we are consciously helping people toward self-discovery.

If the CJC teacher is to be totally competent, he needs to strive for certain ideals, all of which are fairly well known by junior college authorities. I've found very little variance between studies of these ideals. In fact, research provides rather consistent answers from an eclectic viewpoint. Study, for example, various community college faculty handbooks that list needed teacher competencies, and you'll find a very high correlation among them. To simplify the structure, I have categorized the competencies into four broad areas: personality, scholarship (knowledge), classroom presentation, and teacher testing and evaluating. After describing these areas, I wish to speak briefly about the needs of a university training program for CJC teacher-candidates.

II. Behavior of the Personality

(See Enclosure I)

The role of personality in effective teaching is strongly supported by scholarly authority, including Dr. Earl Pullias, the distinguished professor of higher education at U.S.C. Like Pullias and others, I am personally convinced that personality is the key to greatness in teaching. At the CJC level, personal qualities are absolutely necessary for effective teaching. Many of the CJC student complaints of teachers can be traced to personality defects, including the teacher's philosophy and attitude. Evidence shows that the universities need to pay more attention to this problem area, some major criteria of which are the following:

A. Psychological Stability: Authorities tell us that much of society suffers from psychological disturbances. Teachers are not immune from these disturbances. The teacher with a psychological hang-up of some sort is often unable to concentrate upon his tasks. The psychologically well-adjusted teacher reveals confidence in himself and his abilities, he handles tense situations with emotional calmness and effective objectivity, and he is able to maintain a professional demeanor, even when faced with inner conflicts.

B. Friendliness: In the CJC are fairly close relationships. In the classroom the best student learning usually results when the teacher takes a friendly, earnest interest in the welfare of his students. A friendly behavior creates more pleasant and often more productive faculty relationships and faculty-administrative relationships. Within the community itself the friendly teacher creates a favorable public image of the college, and a favorable college image helps to motivate greater local financial support of the college. Obvious? Then why is it that we still have some rather unfriendly personalities on our campuses?

C. Compassion: To help CJC students, being, as they are, greatly in need of guidance and counseling services, the teacher must have a compassion for their problems and insecurities. The friendly teacher is not always compassionate. What we want here is willingness to listen to students, willingness to understand them, and willingness to meet with and help them outside of class. Compassion helps to make students aware of their potentials for personal success, an awareness without which there can be little success. Compassion offers encouragement.

D. Enthusiasm: Studies show that the enthusiastic teacher creates enthusiasm in student learning. When the student is excited about his learning, the learning accelerates at a rapid pace. In essence, the teacher who loves his work and shows it will automatically motivate many students. Of course, the value of the course work must be shown. When the students realize this value, when they become self-motivated by practical need, their minds suddenly become supercharged with energy. For one reason or another, we do have some CJC teachers who lack enthusiasm, and yet enthusiasm may well be the most important characteristic of the effective teacher.

E. Honesty: The honest or "ethical" teacher pays dividends to effective teaching. He will teach the truth of his subject, including viewpoints other than his own. He will not knowingly falsify evidence or attempt to indoctrinate his students or force his values upon them. He will not try to bluff his students into believing he has all the answers. He will temper his honesty with compassion when dealing with student abilities. He will never be blunt or use his honesty to deflate, degrade, or demoralize his charges. Such honesty will also extend to his other professional duties.

F. Self-discipline: A disciplined personality is the kind that does his work efficiently. He plans ahead. He is organized. He is punctual. He remembers. He knows the details of his job. He is fastidious. Being all these things in the classroom means that his students have a worthy model for emulation, for it is obvious to most of us that the self-disciplined student succeeds whereas the undisciplined student has a tendency to fail. The typical CJC student tends to have far less self-discipline than does the senior college or university student. The problem becomes one where the teacher has to motivate proper study habits and a desire for improved quality of performance.

G. Analysis (logic): An intellectual trait of the personality is the use of analysis, or logic. The analytical or logical person knows how to handle the myriad number of intellectual tasks that must be faced. Virtually everything is subject to critical or logical conception, treatment, and evaluation, from establishing a course outline to answering a student's question. In many ways, the ability to reason is more important than the mere acquisition of knowledge, such as facts within one's academic discipline. Universities which tend to stress factual knowledge should remember that, in reality, education is what's left over after we've forgotten the facts. Because of the diversity of the CJC student body, the analytical problems facing the CJC teacher are also diverse and often complex.

H. Creativity: We sometimes overlook the fact that teaching, at its best, is a creative art. Unlike persons in other art forms, the teacher can never specialize or limit himself to one mode of his art. Contrary to Barzun's belief, I feel he must know all the modes of teaching and be able to blend them well for one situation and then convert quickly to another blending for an entirely different situation. The creative personality is one who changes his

modes dynamically through a system of trial and error. Like other creators, he is acutely aware of results--the effects upon his class audience. The CJC, according to B. Lamar Johnson of U.C.L.A., lends itself well to creative innovations and is in fact making great headway in this area. Certainly, creative teaching is necessary for solving the problems of CJC student learning.

Existing are many other personality traits for effective CJC teaching, but I consider these eight to be extremely important.

III. Behavior in Scholarship (Acquisition of Special Knowledge)

The proper scholastic behavior of the CJC teacher is that behavior which reveals or demonstrates an understanding of certain specialized knowledge beyond general and liberal foundations. Receiving his first college degree, a hopeful young teacher-candidate rushed to the local community college and told the dean, "Here I am, Sir. I have my A.B." And the dean replied, "Sit down, son, and I'll teach you the rest of the alphabet." Briefly, here is the rest of the alphabet:

A. Mastery of knowledge in two or more related fields: The specialist in CJC teaching is not one who knows more and more about less and less. On the contrary, he needs more breadth than depth of preparation, particularly in two or three related subject fields. The CJC can use his services more profitably this way. More important, his students receive added benefits from his wider area of knowledge. The wider the knowledge, the greater the benefits. Of course, the master's degree is standard.

B. Knowledge of research techniques: Although the CJC does not place much value on the teacher's ability to research and publish, the institution does expect its teachers to keep abreast of current literature and to apply the research findings in the classroom. Thus, he must know research techniques. (Synthesis)

C. Knowledge of theories of teaching: The CJC teacher must know the theories of teaching and the strengths and weaknesses of each theory. He must know when a particular teaching form is better than another (discussion, for instance, works better than lecture when class groups are small), how to supplement or complement the basic form. His need in this area extends to an understanding of tests and measurements, of basic and technological aids, and of forming a sound philosophy of teaching and learning.

D. Knowledge of the CJC as an institution: It is inconceivable that a CJC teacher could do an effective job when he is ignorant of the overall institutional environment, particularly the CJC purposes and functions. He needs to know how the institution is organized, who supports, who governs it, how it is accredited, the what and how of articulation and coordination activities. This knowledge gives him the proper understanding for such duties as serving on an accreditation team.

E. Knowledge of CJC curricular programs: The CJC teacher must know how his subject relates to the total program for student needs and services, fundamentals of general and special education courses, and machinery for establishing courses.

F. Knowledge of CJC students: Although working in an institution of higher learning, the CJC teacher must realize that his is also an institution

of higher yearning. His students make all the difference in his teaching style. He must know how to work with all the variables of age (18 to 80), abilities (intellectually deficient to occasional brilliance), socio-economic status (disadvantaged to elite), motivations (low to high), personalities (negative to positive), and so on. In higher education, there is no greater diversity of students than in the community-junior college. The teacher who fails to recognize this fact fails to become an effective teacher.

G. Knowledge of professional duties and functions: Variations of professional duties and functions among community colleges tend to be minor, although there are inconsistencies. Existing is a standard core different from that found at other levels of instruction, and yet there is an overlap of needed skills, such as grading and counseling, textbook selection, and participation in faculty committees. Like the actor, he will play many roles upon the campus stage of activities, and he must be properly prepared with the knowledge to face his responsibilities.

IV. Behavior in Presentation (Communication)

Nowhere do personality and scholarship show up more glaringly than in the teacher's processes of communication and classroom presentation. Here we find competencies, skills, and attitudes in action. Perhaps the most negative kind of action--if we can call it action--is the kind of dull lecture whereby the notes of the instructor become the notes of the student, without passing through the minds of either. Perhaps the most positive action is when students become involved in creative learning, when there is dynamic instructor-group interaction. The effective CJC teacher is skillful in dialog as well as monolog, in using humor as well as facts, and in listening as well as speaking.

Classroom teacher skills tend to be the same at all levels of learning except for those that relate more specifically to one student need or another. Certainly well known in education are these general skill areas: setting instructional goals (see Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives), selecting course content (significance, the Key), organizing and developing course content (clarity, the Key), manual use of technological aids, selection and use of non-technical aids, motivational practices, criticism and praise, language style, social and communicative interaction, vocal delivery, and physical animation. Those of you who teach know the usual techniques in these areas, I believe. I would, however, like to mention at least six skills needed by the CJC teacher because of student characteristics commonly found:

A. Skill in dealing with unmotivated students: The other day in the graduate course that I teach at U.S.C., one of my students surprised me by asking, "Students are self-motivated at the junior college level, aren't they?" The truth is that very few are highly dedicated and enthusiastic about their college studies. Most think about units and grades or personal problems instead of what they can learn. The standard answer, of course, is to show the students how the course relates to their special needs and interests.

B. Skill in helping students make career decisions: The typical CJC student is undecided about his future plans, particularly his life work. When forced to make decisions about his major, he writes down such vague areas as liberal education or general education. "Oh, I just wrote that down because I had to answer the item; I don't know what I want to do--or be," he says. Thus, we find the CJC teacher doing a real service for his students when he discusses the occupational aspects of the subject he teaches.

C. Skill in handling socio-economic differences: About two-thirds of the typical CJC student body are in lower socio-economic levels of society. Commonly, more than fifty per cent of the students work outside of college. Making a subject relevant to the disadvantaged and culturally deprived is a complex problem, but it can and must be done. The CJC teacher needs to be skillful in developing mutual respect, in eliminating the barriers of misunderstanding, in finding a common ground for proper learning. Since many do work, the teacher should walk a narrow line between too much homework and too little homework, too many challenges and too few challenges.

D. Skill in dealing with differences in maturation: Since student ages range so greatly, the CJC teacher needs skill in bridging the communication gaps. Problems of mutual concern can be found for social and communicative interaction. Marriage, for instance, is a universal subject. Both the old married folks and the teenage single students can share ideas with each other and learn from each other. Many of the young suffer frustrations of striving for independence, while many of the older people suffer frustrations of too many responsibilities.

E. Skill in relating to a wide range of intellectual ability: Although the ability range is wide, the main problem is in the varying rates of learning (programmed instruction is one solution to this problem). The CJC teacher might have the brighter students become involved in helping to teach the class. High ability students could also be involved in individual tutoring. Additional teacher help can come in lab or office sessions. Note that it is not a matter of lowering standards; it is a matter of helping low ability students to reach reasonable standards.

F. Skill in counseling: It is a well known fact that the attrition rate in most community colleges is very high. In many ways CJC teachers can help to keep students in their classes by effective teaching procedures. For instance, during the first week of a class the teacher must be a good salesman; he must convince students that they need the course. But even a good salesman loses a few customers. In addition to class counseling, the CJC teacher frequently is counseling students in respect to non-education problems. He is in a position to help students in many ways.

V. Behavior in Evaluation

We talk about testing and evaluating students, but what we are really doing is examining student achievement to see how well we have taught. In the process we must avoid traps on both sides of the coin. When his students do very well, the instructor says, "Look at this outstanding student achievement; this shows how excellent I am as an instructor." When they do poorly, he says, "I've just got a bunch of dumb students, that's all." Quick to accept praise and quick to reject blame: that's the maladjusted teacher for you.

The realistic CJC teacher accepts the fact that no given group of students will achieve course goals to the same extent. He will know that his evaluation methods are only a relative way of finding varying degrees of achievement. Unless his testing is standardized with available norms, he will rely upon norms set by his class rather than norms set by himself. He will evaluate both theory and practice skills, and he will use a variety of means to do it. He can properly judge himself as an effective teacher only if he finds that all of his students seem to be achieving at or about the level of their capabilities. His chief areas of concern are four in number:

A. Paper-type testing: Writing excellent examinations can be as hard as any job the teacher has. It takes great skill, understanding, and patience in the preparation stage. The scoring of objective-type paper tests is a simple, mechanical process. Essay examinations are more difficult to score, but easier to prepare. Such other tests as term papers and written book reports require teacher skill in detecting significant values in theme, content, organization, and language usage. By the way, teacher comments written in page margins can be extremely beneficial to student learning and morale.

B. Vocal and/or physical performance tests: This type of test grows naturally out of courses requiring performance skills. Evaluation of such performances can be easy at times. For instance, the student's typing speed can be ascertained simply by checking the number of words typed per minute. On the other hand, evaluation can be difficult in creative areas, such as acting, singing, and speaking. In such cases of observation, the teacher needs an evaluative ability to determine how well the art form is being exemplified. On record are many examples of poor teacher judgment of student talent. For instance, one teacher reportedly told Jack London that he would never be able to make it as a writer. Clearly, the teacher must be able to recognize performance talent when he sees it.

C. Testing procedures: As already indicated, the effective teacher will employ various types of test measures. He will revise his tests frequently, just as he revises frequently his formal lectures. Through the years he can devise his own standardized tests which provide much more accuracy of measurement. With item analysis, he will strengthen his tests. He will be able to judge effectively the frequency of testing in terms of student needs. He will know that tests have an instructional as well as a measurement value. Thus, he will take the time to "go over" the test with students after it has been scored. To improve motivation for study, he will include some ungraded trial tests. Finally, he will invite student criticism of his testing procedures. The effective teacher not only encourages criticism, but he is willing to admit to errors of testing judgment.

D. Grade applications: A father asked, "Well, son, how were your marks in college this year?" "Underwater," the son replied. "What do you mean underwater?" The son smiled and said, "Below C level." The last thing we can do for our students is "turn in" a grade for each of them. Much depends upon the teacher's philosophy of grading, his standards and applications. As you surely know, intellectual abilities tend to be more homogeneous from a lower to a higher level of learning. The effective CJC instructor remembers this in establishing his grading pattern. He will give reasonable grade weights to the various testing activities of his course. He will keep his students informed as to their progress and current grade quality. He will not threaten with grades but will strive to de-emphasize them so that students can concentrate on their actual learning. For those students falling underwater, he will offer all the extra help he can give them in order to bring them to the water's surface. Personally, I do not believe in the F grade for the CJC level. If a student cannot pass a course at this level, I think he should be given a W for withdrawal, even on the last day of class. Let him try the course again, if he must, but give him the privilege of starting again with a clear record. Grades are often harmful to students; I ask, "Are we there to harm them--or to help them toward self-fulfillment?"

VI. The University Training Program for CJC Teaching (See Enclosure 2)

As Lady Godiva said near the finish of her historic ride, I am now drawing near to my "close". I wish to add some "clothes" to this bare body of exhortation by speaking briefly about a university training program for CJC teaching. Hopefully, I will not tred on the toes of others who speak on the subject at this confe.ence.

A. University responsibility: First, I think the university should train these teachers and should not graduate the candidate from the program until it is sure that the new teacher will be reasonably successful on the job.

B. Performance-type courses: The training courses should be titled and structured according to performance needs. Teaching is a performance-type profession. Determine what CJC teachers need to do and then help them learn how to do it. A few colleges in California have received grants of money to do just this for teachers at lower levels of learning. It is possible that these courses could be short in duration, say four, six, or eight weeks. The courses should be in some form of chronological order, from simple to complex performance needs.

C. Psychological testing: Screen your program candidates through a system of psychological testing. Personality is such an important consideration in good teaching that it, too, needs to be tested. Certainly, the university would be doing our profession a service by screening out those who fail to reach a satisfactory level of mental and emotional security and adjustment.

D. Intellectual testing: A CJC teacher, dealing as he does with programs of higher learning, needs to have a higher intellect than one who is matriculating for a Bachelor's degree. After all, the teacher in higher education deals with students of higher intellect, and, while he does not need to be a genius, he needs to work with human beings on as nearly an even basis as possible.

E. Achievement testing: Have your students take an achievement test before being admitted to your training program. Include on the test general education survey questions. Insist that the candidates have general (not specific) mastery of two related major subjects, along with understanding in one or two minor subjects. Mastery and understanding of these subjects should come from their undergraduate training, since undergraduate courses are what the CJC teachers will teach.

F. Two-year training program with internship: Ideally, I see a two-year training program. The first year would include courses chiefly in a school of education. Needed would be such courses as Characteristics of the CJC student, Teaching methods, Tests and measurements, Research practice, Professional duties, the CJC as an institution of higher learning, and so on. (Some courses in his teaching field can be part of his program.) The second year would require CJC-university cooperation in placing a teacher on salary as a full-time intern teacher. Thus, the candidate would be guaranteed an intern job with pay. Only after these two years would he be granted a master's degree in teaching at the CJC level. Internship teaching would not be counted as credit toward tenure, unless the same institution hired him on a permanent basis. If the training is sound, this kind of program could eliminate the need for probationary status.

G. Final university interview and issue of credential: After the year of internship, a university committee could clear all remaining barriers before granting the master's degree. The university, as authorized by the state, could then issue the teacher his license or credential for teaching. A placement service at the university should help him secure a job.

H. Doctor of Arts Program*: A doctor of arts degree, as presently envisioned, would be a deeper probing into teaching. I see the degree as a seventh year (possibly eight) of investigation into problems at the CJC level. Research is needed at this level, but such research should reveal some practical results in a changed, improved CJC. With such a program of seven or eight years of university training, the teacher could be as highly respected as our medical doctors (with luck they might even make as much).

I. Impact upon the CJC: Such a program as I have suggested would be, I believe, a dramatic improvement in the status of the CJC. Administrators would feel more confident about your graduates. They would need no formal teacher in-service education functions of a university training nature. They would need to face rarely the task of firing a probationary teacher. The university would be doing a service that would extend downward to help CJC students receive the greatest possible benefits from effective teaching.

VII. Conclusion

Well, I've finished the oratory. You know what that is, don't you? It's the art of making deep noises from the chest sound like important messages from the brain. But I've defined the nature of the task as identification, translation, training, evaluation, and prediction. We can identify the traits that CJC teachers need. We can offer a training program for meeting these translated needs. Finally, we can evaluate the results and predict reasonable success. We can do these things because we are capable of doing them. We will do these things because we have the wisdom to do them.

Will the CJC training program eventually become the S.S.T. of education? I doubt it, but you can't tell about life in America. The other night Bob Hope spoke of the S.S.T.'s defeat. "That's America," he said, "last in aerospace and first in hot pants."

Are there any questions?

---

*I consider the traditional Ph.D. virtually worthless in helping to make a teacher effective at the CJC level. This is one reason why I took an Ed.D. degree, as many courses related more specifically to effective teaching.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EFFECTIVE CJC TEACHER

I. PERSONALITY

A. Psychologically well-adjusted
B. Friendly
C. Compassionate
D. Enthusiastic
E. Honest (ethical)
F. Self-disciplined
G. Analytical (logical)
H. Creative

II. SCHOLARSHIP (KNOWLEDGE)

A. Knowledge in two or more related teaching fields
B. Knowledge of research techniques
C. Knowledge of theories of teaching
D. Knowledge of the CJC as an institution
E. Knowledge of the CJC curricular programs
F. Knowledge of CJC students
G. Knowledge of teaching duties and functions in the CJC

III. PRESENTATION (COMMUNICATION SKILLS)

General

A. Selection of course goals
B. Selection of subject-matter content
C. Organization of content
D. Use of technological aids
E. Use of non-technical aids
F. Use of communicative means
G. Use of voice and body in delivery

Specific

A. Motivating the unmotivated
B. Relating the subject to student needs and interests
C. Handling socio-economic differences
D. Dealing with differences in maturity
E. Dealing with wide range of intellectual abilities
F. Counseling students with individual problems

IV. EVALUATION OF STUDENTS

A. Skills in paper-type testing
B. Skills in vocal and/or physical testing
C. Skills in testing procedures
D. Skills in grade applications

(Also needed are specific skills of performance in item II. SCHOLARSHIP. For instance, it is one thing to know that the CJC teacher works on a faculty committee but quite another thing to be able to function effectively on the committee. The specific skill needed here is that related to the psychology of effective human relationships.)

A MODEL TRAINING PROGRAM FOR CJC TEACHERS

I. UNIVERSITY RESPONSIBILITY: To train and graduate only those who can be predicted to be reasonably effective teachers.

II. PERFORMANCE-TYPE COURSES: Course titles and structures centered around what the teachers must do on the job.

III. PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING: The candidate's psychological and personal traits to be tested prior to program admittance.

IV. INTELLECTUAL TESTING: The intellect, required to be higher than that for entering freshmen, to be tested prior to program admittance.

V. ACHIEVEMENT TESTING: The students to show a general mastery of at least two related subject fields and to be tested prior to program admittance.

VI. TWO-YEAR PROGRAM OF TRAINING:

A. First year to be professional education courses with possibly some special work in their major subjects.

B. Second year to be a full-year of paid internship in cooperation with a community-junior college.

VII. FINAL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REVIEW:

A. To clear all remaining questions of the candidate's capabilities.

B. To grant the candidate a Master's Degree in teaching, with specific major and/or minor fields identified, i.e., Master of Education Degree in Social Science.

C. To issue the candidate his license or credential to teach (in cooperation with the state).

VIII. DOCTOR OF ARTS DEGREE:

A. Concentration on research in teaching--or additional advanced courses in teaching at the CJC level.

B. To be issued after one (possibly two) years.

IX. PROGRAM IMPACT UPON THE CJC:

A. Would tend to eliminate CJC in-service education of a traditional nature.

B. Would tend to eliminate the necessity of probationary status for the teacher.

C. Would tend to improve student learning, our REAL goal.

D. Doctor of Arts Degree would tend to place teachers on a level (professional, at least) with medical doctors.

QUALITIES OF GOOD TEACHING

I. Effectiveness of Teaching.

a. Student relationships.
1. Creates a favorable learning atmosphere.
2. Creates an interest in the subject.
3. Expects a high standard of performance.
4. Provides for individual differences.
5. Gives outside help to students.

b. Presentation of material.
1. Applies subject matter to present day needs.
2. Uses reference and supplementary material.
3. Is well prepared for class work.
4. Speaks interestingly and understandably.
5. Knows his subject.

c. Effectiveness in Classroom Management.
1. Provides for physical well being of students.
2. Develops proper social control.

II. Personal Attributes.
1. Is tactful and considerate.
2. Is well groomed.
3. Has good health and energy.
4. Has emotional stability and control.
5. Has a sense of humor.
6. Has integrity and is sincere.

III. Instructor Relationships.
1. Is loyal to his colleagues.
2. Avoids pettiness, jealousy, and rancor.
3. Avoids gossip or personal criticism regarding colleagues, especially in the presence of students.

IV. Professional Attributes.
1. Is a member of professional organizations.
2. Is interested in improving his teaching.
3. Reads professional literature.
4. Attends professional meetings.
5. Is punctual.

V. Relationships with College, Administration, and Community.
1. Adheres to school policy and participates in democratic formation or revision of school policy.
2. Feels a sense of responsibility for the over-all effectiveness of the college.
3. Cooperates with the program of student activities.
4. Is prompt and accurate with reports and records.
5. Has satisfactory business and social relationships with the community.
6. Attends faculty meetings.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INSTRUCTORS

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Report accurately the attendance of each student as required during each attendance period.

2. Responsible for the care of all equipment in your room and other rooms used for one or more periods. Each instructor should see that students do not write on desks or in any way deface school property.

   Each teacher is responsible for locking his or her classroom at the end of each class period. This helps safeguard instructional equipment and supplies.

3. Regulate the heat, ventilation and light in your classroom.

4. Turn off lights and gas, close windows, and lock door when room is last used each day.

5. Keep all facilities locked when not in use.

6. Discharge all assigned duties regularly. In case of illness notify the Vice-President for Instruction.

7. Keep an accurate record, in the grade book provided, of each student's work and turn it in for filing at the close of the school year.

8. Make out and record grades as requested by the administration.

9. Accept and carry out to the best of your ability extra-curricula supervision and duties assigned by the administrative staff.

10. Constantly strive to improve the methods, content and worthwhileness of each course you teach, at all times striving to better understand the students you teach and their needs for the present and future.

11. Assume responsibility for teaching, good citizenship, and respect for the rights of others and respect for property.

12. Attend all faculty meetings.

13. Give tests on the days assigned in the examination schedule unless permission to do otherwise has been received.

14. Each instructor is to establish office hours when available for student conferences. This schedule should be posted on the office or classroom door. A minimum of one conference hour per day is required.

15. Counsel students when there is opportunity, realizing that the individual instructor often has the finest opportunity for effective guidance.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INSTRUCTORS - Cont.

16. Fill out and promptly return all requests for information made by the various offices.

17. Students are not to be failed for the semester unless they have received written notification of low work or possible failure at mid-term. Exceptions to this may be made by conference with the student and written statement by the instructor to become a part of the student's record.

18. Each instructor must realize his importance as a public relations agent. Each contact, whether with a student or with a member of the community, is of importance in the public relations program. No school can have a better reputation than its faculty. The faculty makes the school.

19. Report in writing to the Vice-President for Instruction any special problems with students.

20. Instructors who teach evening classes should assume the same duties and responsibilities to the evening program as those of the day.

THE CONFERENCE COORDINATOR SUMMARY

Because of the many functions of the comprehensive community junior college and the heterogeneity of the community it serves, it appears that the traditional teacher education program is not satisfactory in training instructional personnel for this relatively new and developing institution.

The comprehensive role of the junior college demands a training program which requires the prospective teacher to rethink his educational philosophy in terms of student and community needs. He must be aware of and know how to use the latest teaching methods and machines so that as a teacher he can make his subject relevant and realistic in the eyes of the student consumer--a student that may range in age from 17 to 70 and have a span of educational goals ranging from a baccalaureate degree to retraining for a new vocation.

The development of a teacher training program which will take into consideration all these purposes, demands (a) a new approach to the selection of teaching training candidates, and (b) attention to the qualifications and experiential backgrounds of those guiding the training.

Two types of junior college instructional personnel preparation programs appear to hold promise. First, the short term workshop which will (a) give current junior college teachers an opportunity to review, evaluate, and improve their instructional methods and practices in light of new information and techniques, and (b) provide an opportunity for the potential junior college teachers to gain some basics in the art of instruction on the post high school level--specifically in the comprehensive institution. Such workshops might be developed using regular summer sessions or between semester breaks during the academic year to enroll those teachers whose institutions provide for an independent study or experience period at midyear. The design of such a short term workshop provides a unique challenge to the graduate college and university.

Second, a graduate degree training program specifically designed to prepare teachers for new instructional challenges in the comprehensive community junior college would provide an "in depth" training experience for both prospective and practicing teachers. At the present time, the long term program might best focus on training teachers in developmental and occupational areas.

Finally, the Conference leadership acknowledges with gratitude the interest and participation of all who attended. The coordinator wishes to recognize specifically the speakers, discussion group leaders, session and summary chairman, and the Conference Arrangements Committee for their cooperation in making the 1971 meeting possible.

Participants
COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE CONFERENCE
April 15-16, 1971

Anderson, Waldo - University of Arizona
Arter, Margaret - Arizona State University
Ashman, M.R. - Consultant - Scottsdale

Barnes, John - Yavapai College
Belzil, Anita - Scottsdale Community College
Berg, William - Arizona Western College
Berry, William E. - Glendale Community College
Bogart, Quentin J. - Arizona State University
Boyle, Maida B. - Arizona State University
Bresina, Bertha - Arizona State University
Brimley, Susan - Mesa Community College
Brophy, Gene - Arizona State University
Bruemmer, Norbert I. - Maricopa Technical College
Burke, William J. - Arizona State University
Burns, Gib - Arizona State University

Clanton, Edwina - Maricopa Technical College
Condon, John T. - Arizona State Board of Directors for Jr. Colleges
Conrath, Ken - Arizona State Board of Directors for Jr. Colleges
Cothrun, David - Arizona Western College
Creason, Neal - Mesa Community College
Cullen, Joe C. - Arizona State University
Curtis, Dean A. - Eastern Arizona College

Dannenfeldt, Karl H. - Arizona State University
Donaldson, Marion G. - Scottsdale Community College

Edwards, John R. - Cochise College

Fletcher, Harry D. - Maricopa Technical College
Flores, William - Central Arizona College

Gallagher, Robert E. - Northern Arizona University
Gilliland, Joe - Cochise College
Goldsmith, Raquel - Pima College
Groenke, Glenn - Scottsdale Community College

Hall, George C. - Arizona Western College
Hanhila, Matt - Glendale Community College
Harper, Ken - Pima College
Harris, Thomas - Arizona State University
Hawkins, Charles - Maricopa Technical College
Highman, Del - Yavapai College
Hoyt, Roy W. - Arizona State University
Hunt, Eugene M. - Yavapai College

Janeczko, Stan - Arizona State University
Johnson, Don R. - Cochise College
Jones, Rick - Pima College

Kelley, Win - Citrus College, California
Keyworth, Fred - Mesa Community College

Letebure, Rene D. - Pima College
Lowell, James - Pima College

Martinez, Lionel J. - Maricopa Technical College
McBride, Clarence - Eastern Arizona College
McGrath, Wayne - Eastern Arizona College
Melone, R.J. - Pima College
Morrison, Fred - Phoenix College
Mosley, Bill - Mesa Community College
Moss, James N. - College of Ganado

Newburn, Harry D. - Arizona State University
Nix, Elmer - Arizona Western College
Noll, Nancy L. - Arizona State University
Noll, Robert - Arizona State University

Ostar, Allan K. - American Association of State Coll. and Universities

Pardini, S.J. - Arizona State University
Patterson, Pat - Arizona State University
Pence, Don P. - Central Arizona College
Peterson, Dwight - Phoenix College
Platt, Merle - Arizona State Board of Junior Colleges
Prince, John F. - Maricopa County Junior College District

Reynolds, James W. - The University of Texas
Riggs, John D. - Mesa Community College
Romesburg, Kerry - Arizona State University
Roper, D.J. - Arizona State University
Russo, Joe - Yavapai College

Sperstad, M.L. - Arizona State University
Stailey, Wilford - Eastern Arizona College
Stevens, John - Arizona State University
Stevens, Steve - Arizona State University
Stout, Minard W. - Arizona State University
Struridis, George - Arizona State University
Stuart, Keith - Cochise College

Tate, Donald - Arizona State University

Via, L.L. - Maricopa Technical College

Waltrip, John - Glendale Community College
Waltz, James - Phoenix College
Weber, Delbert D. - Arizona State University
Weienert, Don - Arizona State University
Wochner, Raymond E. - Arizona State University
Worsley, Roger - Mesa Community College